



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK

---

JESSE F. STEINER

Director of Educational Service, American Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

---

### I. THE NATURE OF SOCIAL WORK

The term social work which has come to be the accepted designation for a large group of specialized activities in the field of social betterment was not in general use at the opening of the present century. Two or three decades ago such terms as philanthropy, charity, correction, outdoor relief, care of dependents, defectives, and delinquents, were commonly employed by those at work in these fields. This is at once evident in the names of leading organizations established during those early years—the Charity Organization Society, Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, National Conference of Charities and Correction. When Miss Mary E. Richmond, in 1897, made her plea for professional training she urged the establishment of a “Training School in Applied Philanthropy.” The training class which was organized in New York the following year developed later into the New York School of Philanthropy, and this name persisted until very recently when it was changed to the New York School of Social Work.

This early terminology is significant, for it indicates clearly the nature of the field from which modern social work has developed. The social workers of a generation ago were frankly engaged in the work of charity or philanthropy. Their efforts were concentrated upon the disadvantaged and handicapped and represented a growing attempt to understand their problems and solve them through the application of scientific methods. Just because their work was permeated with the scientific spirit it was inevitable that their attention should be increasingly directed to the forces that were dragging men down and making the work of relief such a difficult task.

Thus there developed very naturally a keen interest in what is frequently called the preventive side of social work. Those whose

work was commonly thought of as being in the field of relief began to interest themselves in social legislation and in the improvement of social and industrial conditions. From the ranks of philanthropic workers there arose those who took up the fight against the adverse conditions of life instead of in behalf of the unfortunate who were disabled by those conditions. Investigations of the standards of living and housing conditions, social surveys of various kinds, promotion of recreational activities, organization of communities for the purposes of social betterment, arousing public sentiment against the evils of child labor, and organized efforts to give the general public a social point of view—all these and many other activities of a similar nature became a recognized part of the field of social work.

This change of emphasis in social work from remedial measures to those that strike at the root of social problems caused the whole field under consideration to lose its early definiteness of boundary lines. As long as social work was regarded as the adjustment of the dependent and handicapped to their environment, its activities could be grouped together in a field that was peculiar to itself. Just as soon, however, as it attempted to accomplish its purpose by bringing about modifications of the environment, it allied itself with forward looking movements in many lines of work. In this sense, social work may be regarded as almost identical with the promotion of common welfare and the social worker is the individual of any occupation or profession whose life is actuated by a definite social purpose. Devine's *Spirit of Social Work* is dedicated

to social workers, that is to say, to every man and woman, who, in any relation of life, professional, industrial, political, educational or domestic; whether on salary or as a volunteer; whether on his own individual account or as part of an organized movement, is working consciously, according to his light intelligently, and according to his strength persistently, for the promotion of the common welfare—the common welfare as distinct from that of a party or a class or a sect or a business interest or a particular institution or a family or an individual.

It is at once evident that while such a broad conception of social work may be logical, it leads us far beyond its distinctively technical aspects. An analogy may be found in education which has

both its popular and its professional sides. In one sense a large part of our activities may be looked upon as educational, but nevertheless it is well understood that there is a very clearly defined field for those who have to do with formal education. Social work, because it touches life in so many intimate ways and includes activities that are commonplace and informal in nature, must have its popular side that can be participated in by people of every vocation. This is in fact the purpose of that part of social work which lays emphasis upon the spread of socialized intelligence. The more intelligent people become about social duties and problems, the more active will they be in the promotion of the common welfare. One of the most hopeful signs of the times is the active interest of such agencies and institutions as the school, the church, chambers of commerce, farmers' organizations, etc., in social programs designed to bring about a solution of social problems.

But, however legitimate it may be to speak of social work in this broad sense as merging into many different fields, there is without doubt a point beyond which popular effort cannot go and maintain a high efficiency. It is evident, for instance, that social investigation involves processes for which is required a technique of its own. It is even more clear that technical equipment is needed to deal with the situations that arise in connection with the care of the dependent and handicapped. No one can doubt that the adjustment of the social forces of communities requires the sure touch of a hand trained for its task. These and other similar activities in the general field of social welfare stand out in a well-defined group, not primarily because of what they attempt to do, but because they can be carried on successfully only by those who possess the proper technical training and experience. The social worker may be working hand in hand with many people interested in the same general problems but he is distinguished from them because he is qualified through special training to accomplish well certain tasks that only incidentally come to the attention of those in other fields. Social work defined in this way loses something of the indefiniteness that comes from its close relation to efforts to improve the common welfare. While its results are accomplished through the aid of many allies, it has its distinctively technical aspects which, taken

together, form a group of highly specialized activities that may very well be regarded as the beginning of a new profession.

But the confusion in regard to the proper limits of the field of social work has not resulted entirely from its far-reaching tendencies. Complications also arise from the domination of certain types of social work which more or less consciously regard themselves as occupying a fundamental position in the field of social welfare. This is especially true of the Charity Organization Society movement which must be recognized as the beginning of scientific social work in this country and which has maintained its place of leadership ever since its establishment more than a generation ago. Within this movement has been developed the technique of family case-work which was one of the first examples of the application of scientific methods to social work. The family welfare group have long been prominent in state and national conferences of social workers, and have made very significant contributions to the literature dealing with social problems. It is not surprising, therefore, that family case-work should sometimes be used as synonymous with social work, and that there should be a tendency in some quarters to judge the standing of social workers by training and skill in this particular field.

The natural confusion that results from this point of view can be easily seen. Social work is frequently identified with social pathology in spite of the efforts, led in many instances by family case-workers themselves, in the wider fields of social investigation and community work. There is no clear recognition that social work has progressed to the point where remedial work represents only a part of its field. Instead of placing family case-work in its legitimate position as one of the most important of the special activities of social work, there is a tendency to continue to regard it as the center from which all phases of social work naturally develop.

A scientific interpretation of social work, upon which can be based an adequate plan for professional education, must place in the right perspective the activities that make up its technical field. Unquestionably its remedial and ameliorative activities come first in importance. The problem of dealing with the subnormal and

handicapped presses upon us from all sides. Many generations of social neglect, of toleration of indecent conditions of life, of wilful choice of the things that degrade, have produced their evil results. The proper care of dependent families, of orphaned and neglected children, of anti-social and subnormal individuals, requires skill, and no social worker, whatever his specialized form of work, dare be ignorant of the technique needed in this field.

On the other hand due importance must be given to methods of social investigation, analysis of community life, construction of community programs, the technique of organized recreation, and problems of social work administration. These are aspects of social work that are now demanding many skilled leaders and unfortunately there is no general agreement as to the technique involved or as to the way workers in these fields should be prepared. No system of education for social work can be regarded as adequate until the methods of training in social investigation and social organization are as carefully worked out as is the technique of instruction for the remedial side of social work.

## II. HOW PREPARATION FOR SOCIAL WORK HAS BEEN SECURED

It is a matter of common knowledge that the professional schools of law, medicine, teaching, and engineering began as a supplement to the apprenticeship system which was the original method of preparation for technical tasks. The difficulties these schools experienced in establishing themselves in competition with what were regarded as more practical methods of training can be understood without detailed reference to the past, for in some of these fields, at least, the apprenticeship system is still an active competitor and exerts a restraining influence upon efforts to raise standards of professional education.

A study of the methods of preparation for social work shows no exception to this experience of the well-established professions. The only difference worthy of mention is that social work is a more recent development, and therefore the apprenticeship system is still in vogue to an extent that would hardly be permitted today in other professions.

The apprentice method as it has been developed in the social-work field has been simply a means employed by organizations to train their new workers. The employee in training sometimes receives formal instruction from his superior through assigned readings and conferences, but the training consists chiefly of practical work carried on under supervision. Such an apprenticeship therefore cannot be called training for social work for it gives the worker no well-rounded view of the whole field but prepares him merely for specific tasks within a single organization.

The organization that conducts the training often safeguards its own interests by requiring the new worker to remain in its employ for a stated period of time. In 1898 the Boston Associated Charities requested its agents in training to agree in advance to remain for three years in the service of that Society. The United Charities of Chicago in 1915 demanded a two-year period of service of those whom it undertook to train. This rule, which was quite generally followed, makes it clear that the well-established social work organizations in the larger cities have not desired to accept responsibility for the training of workers not in their employ. In a report read at the National Conference of Charities and Correction at Topeka, Kansas, in 1900, it was stated that

there is but one Society which is making a special effort to train agents and secretaries for positions in newly organized societies and so spreading the gospel of organized charities in other cities. This has no reference to the New York Society which is conducting an excellent six weeks' mid-summer course for those who wish to take advanced work.

Eight years later Mrs. John M. Glenn discussed this same subject in a paper read at the National Conference of Charities and Correction in Richmond, and quoted a field secretary as follows:

I do not know whether large societies feel a responsibility toward small societies or not. The engagement of a field secretary for Charities and the Commons would seem to be an indirect evidence that they do. I don't think we are ready to train workers sent us from other cities, expecting them to go back to work in other cities.

An apprenticeship system that was limited to the large organizations of a few cities, and admitted to training only a number sufficient to take care of their labor turnover, could never meet the

demand for trained workers in a line of work that was constantly expanding. The first public evidence of recognition of this fact in this country was a paper read by Miss Anna Dawes, in 1893, at the International Congress of Charities in Chicago. In this paper, which had as its subject "The Need of Training Schools for a New Profession," Miss Dawes pointed out the desperate situation in which the Charity Organization Society found itself because new societies were springing up more rapidly than trained workers could be supplied. As a result of this lack of skilled leadership an undue proportion of these organizations were either failing utterly or were carrying on their work in a feeble and inefficient manner. In commenting on this situation, Miss Dawes said:

I am convinced that it is not so much lack of willing individuals as entire lack of opportunity for training that is the real trouble. For no matter how much a man may wish to go into this work there is no place where he can learn its duties. . . . What is needed, it seems to me, is some course of study where an intelligent young person can add to an ordinary education such branches as may be necessary for this purpose, with a general view of those special studies in political and social science which are most closely connected with the problem of poverty, and where both he and his associate already learned in the study of books can be taught what is now the alphabet of charitable science—some knowledge of its underlying ideas, its tried and trusted methods, and some acquaintance with the various devices employed for the upbuilding of the needy, so that no philanthropic undertaking, from a model tenement house to a kindergarten or a sand heap, will be altogether strange to his mind. . . . It seems to me that the time has come when either through a course in some established institution or in an institution by itself, or by the old-fashioned method never yet improved upon for actual development—the method of experimental training as the personal assistant of some skilled worker—it ought to be possible for those who would take up this work to find some place for studying it as a profession. . . .<sup>1</sup>

This appeal for a training school did not lead to immediate action. However clearly a few leaders might see the need of trained workers, there was very little recognition of this need on the part of the public. The ninety-two charity organization societies in existence at that time represented an important and growing movement, but they were supported by a limited clientèle, and their methods were not fully understood or approved. Even when we

<sup>1</sup> *Charities Review*, III, 49-51.



add to this list of charity organization societies the organizations that were springing up in related kinds of social work, the field was still too limited in scope to offer many inducements to trained workers. It must not be forgotten also that the public did not regard philanthropic work as a technical activity that required special skill and so quite readily employed as workers in this field those who lacked proper training and experience. This was brought out very strikingly by Miss Mary E. Richmond in an address made at Philadelphia, in 1897, in the course of which she cited the following incidents:

"You ask me," wrote a clergyman, "what qualifications Miss — has for the position of agent in the Charity Organization Society. She is a most estimable lady and the sole support of a widowed mother. It would be a real charity to give her the place." Another applicant for the same position when asked whether she had any experience in charity work, replied that she had had a good deal—she had sold tickets for church fairs. Though those particular ladies were not employed, is it not still a very common thing to find charity agents who have been engaged for no better reason?—like the one who was employed to distribute relief because he had failed in the grocery business.<sup>1</sup>

The National Conference of Charities and Correction, which had been bringing together the leading social workers of the country in annual conference since 1873, gave its first extended consideration to the problem of professional training at its session in Toronto in 1897. At that meeting Miss Richmond read a paper on the subject "The Need of a Training School in Applied Philanthropy," in which she stated her belief that professional standards could not be attained until a training school had been provided. With admirable clearness she pointed out the confusion that existed because the different types of philanthropic workers were not familiar with the common ground of knowledge that underlies all charitable work. She says,

If an agent of a relief society has occasion to confer with the head of a founding asylum, is it not likely that the ends they have in view, that the principles underlying their work, that the very meanings which they attach to our technical terms, will prove to be quite at variance? What an incalculable gain to humanity when those who are doctoring social diseases in many departments of charitable work shall have found a common ground of agreement and

<sup>1</sup> *Charities Review* (June, 1897), p. 308.

be forced to recognize certain established principles as underlying all effective service! Not immediately, of course, but strongly and steadily such a common ground could be established, I believe, by a training school for our professional workers.

Miss Richmond's plan for the school did not go into details, but included recommendations that it be located in a large city where students could have direct access to the work of public and private charitable agencies, that its affiliation with an educational institution should not prevent the placing of emphasis upon practical work rather than upon academic requirements, and that a considerable part of the instruction be given by specialists in the different fields who could be engaged to give their lectures during the less busy months of the year.

At the same meeting another plan was brought forward by Miss Frances R. Morse, which contemplated the development of co-operative normal-training by the larger charity organization centers. In the opinion of Miss Morse, satisfactory training could be provided by setting up a responsible group of advisers who would assign students in training to different organizations for definite periods and exercise general supervision over the students' instruction so as to make sure that it would cover a wider field than that of a single agency. It was in fact a sort of centrally directed apprenticeship system whereby a new worker would be assigned at successive periods to different agencies, thus making it possible to secure a well-rounded experience.

Miss Morse's plan did not meet with general favor and the time did not seem ripe for the establishment of a training school. The following year, however, in the summer of 1898, the New York Charity Organization Society took the first steps in the direction of a professional school by holding a six weeks' training course. In a lengthy editorial on the subject, "A Training School in Charities and Correction," the *Charities Review* of May, 1898, gave the following description of the course to be held that summer:

The main feature of this course is that no tuition is charged, but members of the course are expected to enter the service of the society for six weeks. District work, care of one or more families, investigation of special subjects with one major and one minor report of the results of such investigation are

to be required. There will be daily sessions for lectures and discussions. An attractive program has been arranged under the following general plan.

During the first week the subject of charity organization and general philanthropic work will be considered with visits to the offices in the charities building, industrial agencies of New York and Brooklyn, and other private charitable institutions. The second week will be devoted to the care of dependent and delinquent children and the philanthropic side of mission enterprise. In the third week, study will be made of the public charitable institutions with addresses from the several superintendents and from the President of the Board of Charities Commissioners. Attention will be given to the work of the state Charities Aid Association and the state Board of Charities. The fourth week will be devoted to the study of the care of the dependent sick. Visits will be made to various hospitals, dispensaries, etc. Consideration will be given to the care for the aged, and fresh air work. The fifth week will include some study of general sanitary improvements, the divisions of the health departments and visits to the improved tenements in New York and Brooklyn. The first part of the sixth week will be given to the care of delinquents with visits to the workhouse and penitentiary; the second half to a review of the work of the class, with further study into the functions of charity organization societies in developing the several branches of philanthropic and reform work into unity and precision.

It is not expected that a thorough training will be imparted in this period. No diploma or degrees are to be conferred and no promises made concerning future employment of those who avail themselves of the opportunity offered. As an experimental contribution toward the end in view, the results of the present training class will be watched with interest.

Dr. Philip W. Ayres was placed in charge of the training class which was attended by twenty-seven students representing fourteen colleges and universities and eleven states. According to the report of the New York Charity Organization Society for 1897-98, this course was carried on along the lines indicated in a highly satisfactory manner. The report says,

The immediate results of this experimental course are all that was anticipated. Permanent positions have been secured by some, others have gained valuable material for the university class room, while still others have entered upon special lines of inquiry which will be prosecuted in the future. It is hoped that from this beginning a plan of professional training in applied philanthropy may be developed which will raise the standards of qualifications and of usefulness throughout the entire field of charitable work.

This Summer School in Philanthropic Work, as it was called, filled such a real need that it became for a period of seven years a

regular feature of the work of the New York Charity Organization Society. Until the year 1903, this summer course represented practically the only organized effort to provide systematic training in the philanthropic field. As its purpose was primarily to increase the efficiency of active workers, its attendance was largely limited to those who had at least one year's experience in social work. New workers were supposed to serve a period of apprenticeship with a social agency before becoming eligible to register for the course. The desire for training was so great that it was not difficult to secure students of high grade. Two hundred and fifteen students were enrolled during the period 1898-1904, an average of thirty for each session, which was as large a class as their limited facilities at that time made practicable. Among those who took this six weeks' course are many well-known teachers and specialists in the social-work field. The list of graduates includes: Dr. U. G. Weatherly, professor of sociology, University of Indiana; C. C. Carstens, general secretary, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children; Kate H. Claghorn, instructor in social research, New York School of Social Work; Dr. Carl Kelsey, professor of sociology, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. E. W. Capen, professor of sociology, Hartford Theological Seminary; Eugene T. Lies, formerly general superintendent, United Charities of Chicago; W. Frank Persons, formerly director general, Civilian Relief, American Red Cross; Alexander M. Wilson, formerly director, Civilian Relief, Atlantic Division, American Red Cross; Lillian Brandt, formerly statistician, New York Charity Organization Society; Mrs. Alice Higgins Lothrop, formerly director, Civilian Relief, New England Division, American Red Cross; Paul U. Kellogg, editor of *Survey*; Frances A. Keller, well-known writer and authority on unemployment; Porter R. Lee, director, New York School of Social Work; and Howard S. Braucher, general secretary of Community Service, Incorporated.

In 1903 the training program of the New York Charity Organization Society was extended to include a six months' winter session which provided weekly lectures at a late afternoon hour so that the course would be available for social workers employed in the city. One hundred and forty-seven registered for this course, but the

attendance was irregular on account of the heavy work of the charitable societies caused by an unusually severe winter.

The following year these experimental training classes developed into the New York School of Philanthropy under the direction of the Committee on Philanthropic Education of the New York Charity Organization Society. The first director of the school was Dr. Edward T. Devine, who served in this capacity in connection with his duties as general secretary of the New York Charity Organization Society. A full year's course of training was established which was planned primarily for students without experience in social work. The first year fifty-seven students registered, twelve of whom completed the year's work and received the certificate of the school.

In the fall of the same year, 1904, a similar school was established in Boston under the title "School for Social Workers, Maintained by Simmons College and Harvard University." Its first published announcement stated that it was

a school for the study of charity, correction, neighborhood uplift, and kindred forms of social service, whether under private management or public administration. Its purpose is to give opportunities to men and women to study social problems by practical methods, particularly to those who would become officials of institutions and agencies or would prepare themselves for service as volunteers in this field of work.

The school opened with one classroom and a small office in Hamilton Place, Boston, with an enrolment of twenty-six students. Dr. Jeffrey R. Brackett, the President of the Department of Charities and Correction of Baltimore, was appointed director and remained in active charge of the school for a period of sixteen years.

This demand for trained social workers which resulted in the establishment of these schools in New York and Boston was felt also in other cities of the country where social work was being carried on aggressively. In Chicago the movement to secure trained workers was led by Graham Taylor of Chicago Commons, who took a prominent part in the development of the Chicago Institute of Social Science which was established in 1903 as a part of the Extension Division of the University of Chicago. In the

January, 1904, issue of *The Commons* Graham Taylor wrote as follows concerning this new training course:

At the initiative of a settlement worker, heartily supported by the representatives of practically all the private and public charity and correctional institutions of the city, the University of Chicago will furnish the great facilities of its Extension Department for the establishment of training centers and correspondence courses.

Dr. Taylor was appointed director of the Institute which held its first sessions in the rooms of the University College in the Fine Arts Building on Michigan Avenue. The students were enrolled chiefly from the ranks of those employed by the Chicago social agencies and institutions. The new training course proved so successful that the Russell Sage Foundation, which was one of the most active supporters of the movement to develop professional training for social work, enlarged the Institute by establishing in 1907 a department of Research, with Julia C. Lathrop and Sophonisba P. Breckinridge in charge. The following year the Trustees of Chicago Commons Association, which had, since 1906, assumed responsibility for the administrative expenses of the Institute, transferred the management of the school to a new board organized for that purpose. Steps were immediately taken to establish the school on an independent basis and it was incorporated in 1908 under the name of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. The object of the school as stated at that time was "to promote through instruction, training, investigation, and publication, the efficiency of civic, philanthropic and social work and the improvement of living and working conditions." Graham Taylor still continued to hold his place of leadership in the school and had among his co-workers, Sophonisba P. Breckenridge, Edith Abbott and Allen T. Burns.

Still farther west, in the city of St. Louis, this movement to provide formal instruction in social work appeared almost contemporaneously with its rise in the eastern cities. The interest in social work training in St. Louis first found expression, in the winter of 1901-2, in a series of round-table meetings of the workers in the St. Louis Provident Association under the direction of the General Manager, W. H. McClain. From this beginning there

developed a series of fortnightly conferences of the social workers in the city, followed a little later by fortnightly public lectures given by persons prominent in different fields of social work. Regular classroom work was not begun until 1907, when a course was held in the Y.M.C.A. building, for a period of fifteen weeks, at which twenty-three regular students were enrolled. The first full year's course was begun in the autumn of 1908. While the school was started by the social workers in the city in order to provide training facilities for themselves, it was not developed on an independent basis. Through the efforts of Professor C. A. Wood, of the department of sociology of the University of Missouri, and Mr. W. H. McClain, manager of the St. Louis Provident Association, the school was in 1906 closely affiliated with the University of Missouri. In accordance with the plan agreed upon Dr. Thomas J. Riley of the department of sociology in the university became the first director of the school, thus insuring a vital relationship with the university in spite of the latter's location at a considerable distance from St. Louis. As first organized the school was known as the St. Louis School of Philanthropy. In 1909 its name was changed to the St. Louis School of Social Economy, which remained its title until 1916 when it was rechristened the Missouri School of Social Economy.

The success of the schools of social work in New York and Boston stimulated the social agencies in Philadelphia to provide a training course in that city for the training of their own workers. In 1908 a special training class was held, which was organized the following year as the Philadelphia Training School for Social Work. In the 1910 report of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity, its general secretary, Porter R. Lee, made the following statement in regard to the origin of this school:

In many ways the most important step to which the Society has lent its influence has been the establishment of the Philadelphia Training School for Social Work. Believing that it would be a distinct service to the community to offer training in social work in Philadelphia to Philadelphia people who might thereby be encouraged to remain in the city for their permanent work, the Children's Bureau two years ago established a course of lectures on the practical problems and methods of social work, a large number of which were given by experts from outside the city. The lack of opportunities for field

work in connection with the lectures and the difficulty of holding the students to definite requirements were obstacles to the success of the plan as a training school.

This course has now been expanded into a definitely organized school with a curriculum providing for both class work and field work and for definite tests for graduations. This has been made possible through the co-operation of a large number of the city's agencies for social work of which this Society is one.

The enrolment of the school for the first year was fifty-two. Mr. W. O. Easton, director of instruction of the Philadelphia Y.M.C.A., had personal charge of the administration of the school in the capacity of executive secretary, during the first few years of its existence. The teaching staff was composed of leading specialists in social work in that city. In 1916 the school was incorporated as the Pennsylvania School for Social Service, and under the direction of Dr. Bernard J. Newman, and later of Dr. Frank D. Watson, developed an extensive course of study designed to prepare students for all the more important types of social work.

This movement to develop training centers for social work made its first ventures in the South in 1916 with the establishment of the Richmond School of Social Economy at Richmond, Virginia, and the Texas School of Civics and Philanthropy at Houston, Texas. The former is now known as the Richmond School of Social Work and Public Health and has as its director, Dr. H. H. Hibbs, Jr., under whose leadership the school was organized. The Texas School of Civics and Philanthropy, which was organized by the social agencies of Houston as an independent school, was taken over by Rice Institute in 1918, when its director, Dr. Stuart A. Queen, resigned to enter the military service.

These seven schools fall very conveniently into one group, not merely because they represent similar methods of instruction, but because they are to a large extent the outcome of the efforts of social workers to provide training facilities and have been built up in accordance with the ideals of practical workers rather than with those of university teachers. The schools in this group are usually spoken of as the independent schools, to distinguish them from the departments and schools of social work that have been established within recent years by colleges and universities. As a matter of



fact, only one of these seven schools enjoys the distinction of having been entirely free from academic connections during its entire history.

The New York School of Social Work has from its earliest beginnings been under the direction of the Charity Organization Society of New York and affiliated with Columbia University. In a communication of John S. Kennedy to the president of the New York Charity Organization Society in October, 1904, notifying them of his gift to that organization of securities yielding an annual income of \$10,000 for this new school, he said:

I have also considered the possible desirability of establishing the School as a department of some university, but have decided it should preferably be connected directly with the practical charity work of the city in analogy rather to training schools for nurses which are connected with hospitals, than to any separate university department.

He desired, however, the school to be affiliated with Columbia University and arranged for the president of the university to be a member of the committee in charge of the school. What this affiliation with Columbia involved is stated in the Handbook of the New York School of Philanthropy for the year 1905-6 as follows:

The students of the School of Philanthropy are admitted to any course in Columbia for which they may be qualified without charge of tuition fees, the selection of courses being subject in each instance to the approval of the Director of the School and of the instructor in the University whose course is chosen. Students of Columbia University are given reciprocal privileges in the School of Philanthropy and the work of the School is accepted by the University as the equivalent of one minor subject for an advanced degree.

During the early years of the school's existence this affiliation was strengthened by the fact that Dr. Edward T. Devine and Dr. Samuel M. Lindsay, the first directors of the school, were also members of the faculty of Columbia University. Within the past two years the relation of the school to the university has been modified by a discontinuance of the plan of reciprocal fee privileges.

The School for Social Workers in Boston was organized in response to the requests of the social workers in that city, but was from the first maintained by Simmons College and Harvard University. Later the connection with Harvard was discontinued

and at present this school is conducted as a regular department of Simmons College.

The Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy grew out of the Chicago Institute of Social Science which was conducted under the auspices of the Extension Department of the University of Chicago. In 1908 the school became an independent corporation and maintained that status until 1920, when its work was taken over by the University of Chicago.

The Missouri School of Social Economy was affiliated with the University of Missouri at the time of its first organization. In 1909 this affiliation was transferred to Washington University at St. Louis and the school was conducted as one of the University departments until 1915, when the University severed its relationship with the school because of the withdrawal of the financial support of the Russell Sage Foundation. For one year the school was conducted as an independent enterprise and then was taken over by the University of Missouri which still conducts it under the direction of its Extension Department.

The Pennsylvania School for Social Service has maintained its independent status from its first organization until the present time. The Richmond School of Social Work and Public Health was established independently, but in 1920 was affiliated with William and Mary College.

While all but one of these schools have had at some time in their history, college or university connections, none of their affiliations, prior to the transfer of the Chicago School to the University of Chicago, has been of such a nature that the university has had an active part in determining the policies and standards of the professional school. These schools, whatever their academic affiliations, have been largely under the control of social workers and throughout their whole development have laid their emphasis upon practical training for specific kinds of social work.

Another characteristic of this group of professional schools is the striking similarity in their curricula and methods of instruction. The terminology used in the announcement of courses may vary in different schools but there is little variation in the field they attempt to cover. During the first years of the New York School of

Philanthropy, its courses of instruction were arranged under the following groups: (1) survey of the field, principles, theories and methods of general application; (2) the state in relation to charity; (3) racial traits in the population; (4) constructive social work; (5) the care of needy families in their homes; (6) child-helping agencies; (7) treatment of the criminal. In the announcement of the Boston School in 1905, the topics included in the course of studies were (1) aim of social service; (2) improvement of general conditions of living; (3) neighborhood improvement in city and country; (4) scope of charity; (5) the needy family; (6) persons out of their own families; (7) the criminal. At about the same time the Chicago school announced courses in (1) introduction to the study of philanthropic and social work; (2) personal, institutional, and public effort for dependents; (3) preoccupying and preventive policy, agencies, and methods.

The course of study during those early years was centered around the problem of poverty and methods of work with the handicapped and dependent. This was still further emphasized by the requirement of field work which was carried on largely under the direction of agencies doing case-work with families. This emphasis, which may now seem somewhat one-sided, was then entirely natural and proper because the students' best opportunities for employment were in the case-work field, and few other agencies were prepared to give field work training of any value. This situation, which influenced the early development of these schools, still persists, although to a lesser degree. We are not surprised therefore to find that while the courses of study have been widened to include social investigation, community organization, industrial welfare, mental hygiene, etc., the plan of field-work training has experienced great difficulty in keeping pace with all the newer developments in the field of social work. However much this group of professional schools may differ as to particular courses they offer, they find a common bond of agreement in their emphasis upon their case-work departments and in their insistence that case-work must form a very considerable part of the training of all their students, no matter in which field they intend to specialize.

It thus appears that professional training for social work owes its origin and early development to the initiative of groups of social workers rather than to any leadership given to it by the universities. Even in those instances where university affiliations were made, the movement was led by the social workers and the curriculum was shaped to meet the needs of social agencies rather than made to conform to the usual requirements of a graduate school. It is difficult to conceive how this could have been otherwise when we recall that at the time of the establishment of the first summer course in New York for philanthropic workers, sociology had made a very small beginning as a university study, and that for the next ten or fifteen years sociologists were occupied so largely with debates about method, that their work seemed very remote from the problems in which social workers were interested.

Nevertheless the sociologists were not altogether indifferent to their opportunities in the practical field and in some instances took active steps to correlate their work with that of social agencies. One of the earliest efforts of this kind was a co-operative plan of study worked out in 1894 between the University of Wisconsin and the Associated Charities of Cincinnati. As a result of a series of lectures given the preceding year at the University of Wisconsin by Dr. P. W. Ayers, secretary of the Cincinnati Associated Charities, and another series given at Cincinnati by Dr. Richard T. Ely, of the University of Wisconsin, on "Socialism and Social Reform," two scholarships in the University of Wisconsin in practical sociology were established which entitled the holders to spend the summer vacation in Cincinnati in practical social work under the direction of Dr. Ayers. These two scholarship holders were joined the first summer by eight other college students interested in social science and formed probably the first group of college students supplementing their university studies by supervised field work with social agencies. Mr. C. M. Hubbard, writing in the *Charities Review* of December, 1894, called attention to the fact that this experiment demonstrated the value to universities of this type of laboratory work. The arrangement, however, proved to be only a temporary one, and did not lead at that time to the establishment

of regular courses of instruction in applied sociology at the University of Wisconsin.

Another effort to bring about a vital relation between the study of sociology and the work of social agencies was made during that same year (1894) by the new School of Sociology established in connection with the Hartford Theological Seminary. This school planned a three-year course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Sociology. Specialists from the field of social work were brought in as lecturers and the course included practical field work with social agencies.

As early as 1893, the University of Chicago announced courses in practical sociology to be given by Professor C. R. Henderson, which, if properly correlated with field work, would have afforded perhaps the best opportunity for social work training to be found at that time.

One of the first significant efforts in the university field to give the courses in practical sociology a vocational trend was made in 1910 by Dr. J. E. Hagerty, Professor of Economics and Sociology at Ohio State University. In a bulletin issued that year by the university announcing courses for the training of students in business administration and social science, the following statement was made:

The Social Science group of courses has been arranged for the training of professional and volunteer social workers. The state of Ohio has thousands of paid and volunteer social workers, most of whom are untrained for their work. If it is the duty of the state university to train its students for efficient citizenship, it should offer facilities for the training of professional and volunteer social workers. The new ideas of philanthropy, if put in practice, would reduce the number of dependents and criminals, and make more efficient the state and county institutions and the private charities.

The curriculum, which was primarily designed for the last two years of the undergraduate course, included such subjects as charities, criminology, accounting, psychology, labor organization, labor legislation, races, poverty and preventive philanthropy, animal psychology, abnormal psychology, folk psychology, a seminar in social research, and field work under supervision running throughout the last year. The university had already been conducting courses in applied sociology for a period of five years

and was well equipped to give the required instruction in this field.

This training course differed from the usual courses offered by the independent schools of social work in that it was planned to fit into the undergraduate curriculum, laid a great deal of emphasis upon knowledge of fundamental subjects, and did not give the customary amount of time to field work experience. The demand for training of this kind was sufficient to justify its continuance, and in 1916 social service training became a regular activity of the newly organized College of Commerce and Journalism. This movement at Ohio State University was in a measure typical of what was undertaken in a few other colleges and universities, but in general the technical courses in applied sociology offered by universities prior to the world-war could not be regarded as constituting much more than an excellent background for professional study.

The need of active university participation in education for social work was set forth in a striking manner by Professor Felix Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School at the National Conference of Charities and Correction at Baltimore in 1915. After pointing out the successive steps in the development of medical and legal education in this country, Dr. Frankfurter said:

I submit that what has been found necessary for adequate training for those social activities which we call the profession of law and medicine, is needed for the very definite, if undefined, profession we call social work. I can not believe that the preliminary training of a lawyer, most of his life spent in the adjustment of controversies between individuals, requires less of a background, less of an understanding of what has gone before in life, less of a rigorous critical discipline, than is needed by those of you who go out to pass judgment on the social conditions of whole communities; by those of you who administer laws like the minimum-wage laws, and the other social legislation now administered in great numbers by social workers. Secondly, I can not believe that a training fit to discipline people who shall guide and deal with the social forces of the day, can be done in less time than the time found necessary for the training of lawyers. Thirdly, I can not believe that the experience of medicine and law as to the quality of teachers to train men in those professions, applies less in regard to teachers of social work. I believe social workers, to reach the professional level, must be guided by teachers who give their whole time and thought to it. The time has gone by when the

teaching of any profession can be entrusted to persons who from their exacting outside work of practice or administration, give to teaching their tired leavings.

Finally, and at the center of it all, is complete association with a university. The schools for social work have sprung up, of course, in our large industrial cities. Is not their evolution destined to become an integral part of the universities in those cities to which they are now, in most cases, somewhat platonically attached? For the university is the workshop of our democracy. If it is not that, it has no excuse for being. The university should be the laboratory of this great new mass of scientific and social facts, and the co-ordinator of these facts for legislation, for administration, for courts, for public opinion. The nineteenth century necessarily was a period of specialization, even overspecialization. Our task is to unify and correct the partial facts of the all too scattered social sciences. Mr. Flexner truly pictured the character of social work in showing its close interrelation with medicine and law, and sanitation, and the other applied social sciences. In a scattered way these professional studies are now pursued by the university. The function of the university, however, is to accommodate these various social sciences, to unite in a whole all these facts of life. The schools for social work must be intimate parts of the university, because they must have contact with the other branches of the university's work. I suspect that by a careful scheme of co-ordination our great universities could establish schools of applied social science with very little addition to their existing plant or personnel. These schools need the university. But the university needs the school for social work. Just as the medical school can not do its job well without a connected hospital, so the medical school, and the law school, and other branches of the university, need the experience and the experimentation which a school for social work should produce. These various aspects, necessarily specializations of one common endeavor, should be parts of a single intellectual community.

At the time when this statement was made, only a few of the universities were at all conscious of the important service they could render in this field of professional education. The social workers on their part were not inclined to urge universities to develop their curricula in this direction. As a matter of fact, the belief was quite generally held among social workers that training could be given much more advantageously in an independent school unhampered by academic traditions. The university courses, it was felt, would give an inadequate place to field work and would turn out theorists instead of persons equipped along practical lines.

Without doubt, the prevailing type of instruction in university departments of sociology gave considerable ground for the attitude

of the social workers. Graduate students in sociology preparing for teaching positions were seldom required to supplement their university instruction with clinical experience in the social work field. Their acquaintance with social agencies was usually limited to what could be gained through observational visits or assignment for research based on the data available in their files. It was not uncommon for sociologists equipped in this way to underestimate what is involved in learning the technique of social work. Their attitude toward the social agency was not similar to that of the medical instructor toward the hospital clinic. They were not accustomed to regard participation in the work of a social agency as a valuable means of acquiring scientific knowledge of social problems.

To the extent that the foregoing justly characterized the usual attitude of sociological instructors, it is clear that they were not fitted for leadership in training for social work. But what must not be overlooked was the growing tendency in all the social sciences toward active participation in practical affairs. The psychologists and economists as well as the sociologists were rapidly making a place for themselves outside their customary academic rôles.

Undoubtedly this movement which had been gaining momentum for a considerable time was greatly accelerated during the world-war. Men in academic positions suddenly found themselves called upon to aid in organizing and conducting the network of industrial and social agencies that sprang into activity because of the military situation. The experience gained in this way could not fail to have a profound effect upon their attitude toward practical work.

Moreover, the experience of the universities in modifying their courses of study so as to provide practical training along lines of war work must not be forgotten. Of special significance for departments of sociology were the emergency training courses in home service, which these departments were asked to give in co-operation with the American Red Cross. These training courses were held during and immediately following the war in fifteen universities where, previously, practical training for social work had not been



undertaken. In order that these courses might be as nearly as possible uniform in quality and content, the Red Cross outlined the subject-matter, prescribed the standards of the course, supplemented the teaching personnel of the university and usually assumed responsibility for the field work of the students. Through these home service institutes there was demonstrated the need of training facilities for social work in wide sections of the country where schools of that kind had not existed. By actual experience the university men who participated in these courses came to a proper appreciation of the requirements in this field of professional education. Without doubt the efforts of the Red Cross to establish these training courses were an important factor in stimulating the interest of universities in education for social work.

At the time of the organization of the Association of Training Schools for Professional Social Work in 1919, it was found that nine colleges and universities were doing work of a sufficiently high grade in this field to warrant their enrolment as members of this Association. This list comprised Bryn Mawr College, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Smith College, University of Chicago, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Toronto, and Western Reserve University. This group by no means includes all the colleges and universities now actively at work in this field. Other institutions that are offering this year professional courses in social work are the following: Berea College, Kentucky, University of California, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, University of Indiana, University of North Carolina, University of Oklahoma, University of Oregon, University of Washington, McGill University, Tulane University, and University of Wisconsin. In addition to these, brief training courses were given during the past year in Cornell University, New Jersey State College of Agriculture, University of West Virginia, University of Virginia, Converse College, University of Kentucky, University of Iowa, University of Texas, University of Colorado, Syracuse University, University of Nebraska, University of Missouri, and Iowa State College of Agriculture.

While the experience of these institutions in this field of professional education has covered a very brief period, there are

already evident certain outstanding tendencies that are exercising a profound influence upon methods of education for social work.

In the first place their curriculum is built up to meet the needs of college students and graduates. The usual university standards of admission discourage the attendance of those whose qualifications are based on practical experience rather than upon attainments along academic lines. Students with inadequate academic preparation may gain admission as special students but their inability to get university credit tends to restrict attendance to people of college grade. It is reasonable to expect that the university schools of social work will follow the example of the older professional schools in the universities and gradually raise the entrance requirements until students ineligible to work for a degree will be denied admission.

A second characteristic of their work is their insistence on prerequisite studies in the social sciences as a basis for professional instruction. This of course does not represent so much a new departure as a change of emphasis. The older schools of social work have always recognized the value of knowledge of the social sciences, but with few exceptions they have not insisted upon a thorough-going study in this field as preliminary to a professional course. The attitude of the universities, on the other hand, is seen in their attempt to build up a four or five-year course in which students would, from the beginning of their undergraduate work, specialize in the social sciences.

Again a majority of the university schools of social work have given chief emphasis to courses in small town and rural community problems. The universities have been stimulated to enter this field of community organization largely because of the recent widespread demand on the part of the Red Cross for community workers. The location also of many of these university schools in comparatively small towns has made it natural for them to study the social problems nearest at hand. At present courses in community studies, community organization, recreation, and similar courses dealing with preventive and constructive rather than remedial social work, are receiving increasing attention in most of the universities' schools of social work.

In order to provide suitable field work for these courses dealing with small town and open country problems, it has been necessary to depart widely from the usual methods. Instead of turning students over to a well-equipped agency for practical training, it has been necessary to give them much of their experience in communities where social work had not been well organized. Family case-work has not been neglected but in adapting its methods to small towns and rural situations, the university schools of social work have faced a difficult problem. Of equal importance with this family work is field work with communities and with groups within these communities. This involves experience in community studies, development of community programs, community recreation, and the building up of a public interest in social problems. The university schools of social work located in small towns have had to concentrate their efforts on the development of training facilities in unorganized communities, instead of relying upon social agencies to provide practical training for their students.

The colleges and universities therefore have not only entered the field of education for social work but are already beginning to place their stamp upon standards and methods of instruction. At least twenty-one colleges and universities in this country and in Canada have definitely undertaken to develop schools of social work as a regular part of their activities. The effect of this in taking the control of instruction in social work away from the practical workers and placing it in the hands of educational specialists is already being seen.

### III. THE PROPER BASIS OF EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK

The history of professional education reveals a long struggle to determine the proper basis upon which technical instruction should build. As long as professional standards were low and of little influence, not much importance was attached to the problem of the proper relationship of general to professional education. During the early stages of the development of professional schools of law, education, and medicine, the student entered upon his professional studies without very serious consideration of his previous preparation for that particular field.

Within recent years marked changes have occurred in the standards of admission to professional schools. In 1904 there were only four medical schools in this country that required any college work for admission; in 1917 the number that required one or two years of such work had increased to eighty-three, which was 92 per cent of the total number of medical schools. This same tendency to lay greater stress upon a high standard of general education characterizes also the schools of law, education, and engineering. The inadvisability of specialization without a broad foundation is now generally recognized. In all the well-established professions it is taken for granted that general culture, breadth of view, and a common knowledge of fundamental subjects must go along with technical skill and knowledge, if high professional standing is to be attained.

But even more significant is the growing insistence upon pre-professional studies as a prerequisite to vocational courses. A general education as represented by a high-school or college course has a varying content and therefore cannot be regarded as possessing uniform value as a preparation for the professional schools. Each profession has its fundamental sciences upon which its technical instruction must be based. The student of medicine is soon out of his depth unless he is well grounded in biology and chemistry and is familiar with the laboratory technique of the natural sciences. The engineering student's task is hopeless without an adequate knowledge of mathematics and physics. The legal student should bring to his professional studies a mind well-informed along lines of political and economic science. The instructor in a school of education ought to be able to take for granted that his students are familiar with the principles of psychology and sociology.

As a matter of fact there is as yet no uniform agreement on the part of these professions as to the amount and quality of the strictly preprofessional studies that should be made a requirement of admission to their professional schools. The schools of medicine and engineering which must look to the natural sciences as a basis for their work, have, as might be expected, taken the greatest strides forward in their insistence upon prerequisite studies. On the other hand the professions that find their basis in the broad field of the

social sciences find difficulty in setting up similar standards for prerequisites in that field. Social science from its very nature cannot be as exact as natural science and seems less indispensable perhaps because it is so intimately connected with facts and principles that are more or less matters of common knowledge.

But in spite of the lack of uniform insistence by all the professions on prerequisite studies the tendency in that direction is clear and its correctness unquestioned. Professional schools cannot attain a high standard unless they can assume that their students are properly equipped for technical instruction. The best medical schools recognize this by their encouragement of pre-medical courses designed for the college student who desires a college degree, and at the same time is endeavoring to prepare himself for the study of medicine. While it may be a long time before professional schools are placed on a thoroughgoing graduate basis, the nature of their task and the increasing demands that are made upon them are steadily raising their standards of admission.

In the newer field of professional education for social work efforts to approximate the standards set up by the best professional schools have been hampered by the undeveloped state of social work itself and by the failure of the public to appreciate the value of thoroughly trained workers. Much more than in other professions the apprenticeship system of training for social work is an active competitor with the professional school. Such a large number of people still find employment in social work without the technical equipment that a professional school is expected to furnish that insistence upon high standards of professional education does not yet seem very practicable. For this reason professional schools of social work have usually followed the custom of admitting students to their courses without rigid insistence upon academic requirements. Even though high standards of admission may seemingly be set up, these are likely to be offset by qualifying phrases or alternatives which result in the admission of any student who would be passed upon favorably by a social agency seeking an apprentice worker.

That this is not an overstatement seems evident from the published statements of the entrance requirements of the professional

schools of social work. The New York School of Social Work, which stands among the first in its teaching equipment and high standards of work, states that

the standard of instruction is that of a graduate school. A college education, therefore, or equivalent preparation is essential in order to do the work of the school satisfactorily and profitably. Familiarity with the following subjects is recommended as a foundation for the course: Economics, Biology, History (Industrial and Social), Psychology and Political Science.

The School for Social Workers in Boston requires its applicants to have had either a college education or a high-school education supplemented by sufficient subsequent experience. Their *Bulletin* states:

As a desirable preparation for the school and social work, students in colleges are advised to study the following subjects: physiology bearing on hygiene, psychology, economics, the structure of society, the family, state and local government, one laboratory course in science.

The Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy gave in its last *Bulletin* the following as its entrance requirements:

All candidates for admission must have a general education equivalent to that of a good secondary school and in addition, either, (a) must have taken a considerable part of a college or university course, or (b) must have shown ability in practical work. Satisfactory evidence of good health, good character, capacity for practical work and earnestness of endeavor must be presented.

Students who are graduates of colleges and universities of recognized standing will be admitted to the regular second year courses of the School as candidates for the diploma of the School. Such students must, however, show during the first quarter of the School, ability to do work of a high grade. Otherwise they will be required with the opening of the second quarter to register in the first year courses.

The first year course is offered to meet the need of a large group of persons who wish training for social work, but who have not had the advantage of the pre-professional courses now offered in colleges and universities. It is assumed that those who complete satisfactorily this introductory course will remain a second year. To those who remain and complete a curriculum composed of second year courses arranged by the Registrar and approved by the Dean, a certificate of the School will be granted.

Mature persons who have had practical experience testing in some measure their fitness for social work, trained nurses, teachers, church workers, and others who feel that it is too late for them now to undertake college or university work, will be admitted to this introductory course. Younger persons

applying for admission are advised to prepare themselves for the second year at a good college or university.

In the *Bulletin* of the Pennsylvania School for Social Service it is stated that

candidates for admission to the School must have sufficient intelligence and maturity to deal with social problems. They must be able to express themselves in oral and written English. They must also have studied systematically some of those branches on which a knowledge of society is based, such as history, economics, biology, psychology and sociology. Some laboratory training is deemed essential to insure a scientific approach to social problems.

The Missouri School of Social Economy states that its candidates for admission must fulfill one of the following requirements:

(1) The completion of a college course. (2) Graduation from a recognized secondary school. (3) Definite social service experience in which they have shown special aptitude. Among the general subjects in which proficiency is desirable are economics, sociology, psychology and English.

The Richmond School of Social Work and Public Health requires a high-school education or its equivalent for admission to its courses.

The standards of admission as quoted above indicate the unwillingness of these schools to place themselves on a thoroughgoing graduate basis. Even if it is granted, as they maintain, that their standard of instruction is that of a graduate school, students are admitted to their courses who according to the usual tests would not be eligible for graduate work. The Pennsylvania school makes no academic requirements that can be definitely measured in terms of secondary school or college work. The Missouri school gives three alternatives arranged in descending scale from the point of view of academic standards.

The Chicago school opened its first-year course to those who have a general education equivalent to that of a secondary school, while college graduates were admitted at once to their second-year courses. The Richmond school sets up a similar standard with the exception that the way is left open for mature persons of practical experience to enter the second-year course along with college graduates. The New York school modifies its requirements of a college

education with the statement that it will accept "equivalent preparation" the nature of which is not defined. The Boston school sets up practically the same alternative but defines its "equivalent" to mean secondary school education supplemented by practical experience.

When these entrance requirements are subjected to another test of a graduate school, namely, insistence upon preprofessional studies that would give the students a knowledge of the sciences related to their field of work, an equally unsatisfactory showing is made. In general the value of preliminary instruction in the social sciences is recognized but such instruction is not made an absolute requirement. In their references to these subjects the *Bulletins* usually adopt such phrases as "familiarity is recommended" or a "desirable preparation," instead of a recognizing that technical instruction in social work must be based on a knowledge of the social sciences. Even the Pennsylvania school, which requires candidates to have "studied systematically some of these branches on which a knowledge of society is based," does not enforce this rigidly, for it offers a course called "Scientific Bases of Social Work" which is intended "to provide a background of certain fundamental concepts in biology, psychology, economics, and sociology for those who have not had these subjects in college."

The Richmond school makes no reference at all to the desirability of knowledge of the social sciences. It is worthy of mention that the New York, Boston, and Chicago schools do not include sociology in the list of studies mentioned as desirable preparation for their training courses.

Lack of uniform agreement in standards of admission is found also in the departments of social work maintained by the nine colleges and universities that have membership in the Association of Training Schools for Professional Social Work, but in the case of these institutions, the differences are of another nature. These colleges and universities may be conveniently divided into two groups, each representing a distinct point of view in its methods of providing professional training. The first group includes the institutions that place their departments of social work on a graduate basis and limit attendance to those who hold a bachelor's degree. Strong



emphasis is placed on the satisfactory completion of undergraduate courses in the social sciences and in most cases such courses are an absolute requirement for admission to the technical courses of instruction. This group includes Bryn Mawr College, Smith College, Western Reserve University, and University of Toronto.

In the second group are those institutions that place their chief emphasis upon a four-year undergraduate course of instruction in social work leading to a Bachelor's degree. A year or more of graduate work is also provided but even this, it is urged, should follow the specialized undergraduate course instead of being regarded as giving adequate professional training to any college graduate. It is obvious that the requirements of a secondary-school education for admission to a four-year undergraduate course specializing in preparation for social work cannot be compared with a similar requirement for admission to a so-called graduate school of social work. The institutions that make up this group are the University of Chicago, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, and the Carnegie Institute of Technology.

The foregoing analysis of the present actual basis of education for social work as is shown by the standards of admission of professional schools indicates the wide divergence of opinion among those at work in this field. It reveals on the one hand the tendency of the independent schools to distrust the value of college courses in the social sciences and to make concessions to candidates for admission who have had approved kinds of practical experience. On the other hand the movement in the universities to set up a course of instruction that would begin early in the undergraduate school and cover a period of four to five years, has grown out of their feeling that the social-work student needs a more thorough foundation in the social sciences than is usually obtained in the college course.

In the field of education for social work we find therefore not merely varying standards of admission to the professional schools but important differences in regard to what should constitute the basis of their technical instruction. Should a college education be made a requirement of admission to a school of social work regard-

less of the subjects included in the college course? In view of the varying content of the subject-matter of the courses in the social sciences in different institutions, as well as the differences in the quality of instruction, is it practicable at the present time to set up a high standard of attainment in these sciences as a prerequisite to a professional school? Since social work from its very nature makes such heavy demands upon soundness of judgment, strong personality, and practical experience, should not factors of this kind rather than academic requirements be given chief consideration? Is it wise at this stage of development of social work to set up academic standards of admission to professional schools that cannot be attained by many who otherwise seem admirably fitted to become useful social workers?

It is of help in trying to answer these questions to remind ourselves that the heart of the difficulty lies, in the last analysis, in the chaotic state of social work itself. As long as there is in the wide field of social work no professional organization that concerns itself with standards and gives real unity to the profession it is to be expected that each type of social work will set up its own standards based upon its own experience and point of view. In such a stage of development of social work, science has no assured place. Scientific studies seem far removed from practical work and therefore any alliance with them that places restrictions upon the entrance to social work is regarded as inconsistent with its proper development. It is nothing more or less than the age-long misunderstanding between the practical worker and the man of science. The former was first in the field and is inclined to regard the scientist as an intruder until science has outstripped practice and gained the right of leadership.

In the medical profession the confusion between medical practice and medical science existed until the latter was able in comparatively recent years to demonstrate its proper place in the determination of professional standards. While the social sciences have not advanced as far as the natural sciences they are sufficiently well developed to justify their claim that they must be taken into account in efforts to solve social problems. Any difference of opinion about this must be regarded as due to ignorance of the present

status of the social sciences or failure to appreciate the place of science in modern progress.

If technical instruction in social work is to be based on the social sciences, what is the extent of the foundation that should be required? Certainly the minimum requirement would seem to be the usual undergraduate courses in sociology, economics, history, political science, psychology, and biology. It is difficult to see how anything less could give the student a scientific equipment comparable to that which is expected of the medical student. In the four-year undergraduate course in social work offered by several of the universities this equipment in social sciences comes as a matter of course. The graduate schools of social work, however, will not find it easy to require their candidates for admission to be thoroughly familiar with the social sciences. Taking the country as a whole the majority of those seeking training in social work are deficient in these subjects. Maybe the graduate schools could meet the situation by establishing a preliminary year for the benefit of students who need a better foundation for their technical studies. A better solution perhaps would be to increase the number of universities that give an undergraduate course in social work. The graduate schools then could maintain a real graduate status and would no longer need to give their attention to elementary courses of instruction.

During a period of adjustment it might be necessary to make provision for special courses to meet the extraordinary demand for social workers. This would be especially true in those sections of the country where few colleges and universities give adequate attention to the social sciences. But in a reasonably brief time a sufficient number of students could be found properly prepared for their professional studies. The number that would be lost by the setting of higher standards would be at least partially offset by those who would not have been attracted to the professional school under its present system of instruction.

This emphasis upon academic attainments as a basis of education for social work must not force unduly into the background the personal qualifications that should be possessed by those seeking training in this particular field. While in all the professions the

highest success cannot be won unless technical equipment is supplemented by a high grade of personal qualities, in social work this is pre-eminently true. The social worker's stock in trade seems much less tangible than that of the engineer, physician, lawyer, or teacher. His services to individuals and communities may be vital and based on expert knowledge, but they do not always stand out in such a clear-cut and definite manner that they are easily understood and readily acceptable. For this reason technical knowledge alone is not sufficient. The social worker must be a salesman, a promoter, an organizer. His personality should be such as would command respect and win confidence. He must be a community leader and at the same time possess those qualities of tact, and sympathy, and common sense, and power of will that give him personal influence over those whom he is trying to help.

Personal qualifications, therefore, must also be regarded as necessary prerequisites for technical training in social work. Accurate means of measuring these qualities in applicants for admission to a professional school do not exist. A careful study of a candidate's references often proves insufficient. In order to arrive at a correct judgment, this should be supplemented by personal observation of the student during his period of training. In the undergraduate school of social work a decision about the student's qualifications can be made after the first two years' work before the specialization has gone far enough to make it difficult for the student to change his line of study. In the graduate school, an accurate decision ought to be made about the student's personal qualifications before he enters upon the course. Efforts to raise the standards of education for social work must include due attention to an accurate measurement of personal qualities as well as of academic attainments.

#### IV. TECHNICAL COURSES OF INSTRUCTION

In the discussion of the historical development of schools of social work it has already been pointed out that their courses of instruction were from the beginning of a most practical nature. The instructors in almost all instances were persons engaged in social work who were more interested in imparting to their students

their technique than in following the usual academic type of instruction. Just because the schools of social work were organized in this way they escaped some of the shortcomings that have hampered the progress of other fields of professional education. The first engineering schools were manned by university instructors who carried their university teaching methods into the professional school and as a consequence failed for a long time to adjust themselves to the real needs of engineering students. Medical education also passed through its didactic method of instruction and only gradually built up courses growing out of a scientific handling of experience.

The schools of social work on the other hand began with training classes held by social work organizations for the benefit of their own employees. They were interested in technique rather than in research and sought their teaching material in daily experience instead of in textbooks. The graduates of these schools therefore were usually acceptable to the social agencies, and fitted into available positions without the necessity of making radical adjustments. But while these results were fortunate it must not be overlooked that schools of this kind have a tendency to place emphasis upon immediate needs rather than upon the thorough-going scientific foundation demanded by the best professional standards. It thus happened that the schools of social work, in avoiding the mistakes of academic instruction, went to the opposite extreme of depreciating the value of the scientific studies carried on by the universities. As a natural result the professional schools lost in academic standing and were generally given the same rating as normal schools of the older type. The universities on their part failed for many years to receive the impetus to the development of their work in the social sciences which would have resulted from a frank recognition of the value of laboratory and clinical work in this field.

Within the past few years this traditional gulf between the social scientist in the university and the social worker seems in a fair way of being bridged. Both are finding that they have much to learn from each other and that through a union of effort their common goal can more easily be attained. The social worker is not merely

a practitioner but is also a social scientist. He must therefore be equipped in the use of scientific methods as well as in the practical technique of his daily work.

This new attitude cannot fail to have a marked effect upon the curriculum of the schools of social work. It at once makes it evident as has already been pointed out that this curriculum must be built upon the foundation of scientific studies rather than upon the foundation of general education and practical experience. It is difficult to see how instruction in schools of social work can be of graduate quality if their curriculum is adapted equally well to the needs of college graduates who have specialized in the social sciences and of other students with either less or a different type of preliminary education. As long as students are permitted to plunge into technical courses of social work, as is now frequently the case, without careful study of those sciences that deal with the social order, it is useless to attempt to standardize these courses and maintain them at the high level required in other professions. But while this insistence upon a proper scientific foundation represents a real step forward, it would be unfortunate if the social scientists in the universities attempted to make radical changes in the courses of instruction in social work without an appreciation of the value of the methods that have been followed.

In working out the curricula of schools of social work the custom has generally been to have the courses follow very closely the different types of work carried on by the various agencies. For example the courses given by the New York School of Social Work are grouped under eight departments: case-work, child welfare, industry, social research, community work, mental hygiene, criminology, and medical social service. In some of the courses certain processes characteristic of the different kinds of social work are singled out and the technique of carrying on these processes is made the subject of instruction. Examples of such courses are those dealing with the technique of case-work, the technique of social research, the technique of community organization, and the technique of record keeping. Other courses deal directly with types of social work carried on by the more important social agencies. In this group we find such courses as family welfare, child welfare,

recreation, juvenile delinquency, housing investigation, psychiatric social work, and medical social service.

While some of these courses are similar in title to those offered by a well-equipped university department of applied sociology, their distinguishing characteristic is their emphasis upon technique. The point of view is action, not contemplation and reflection. The students do not stand off and study the problem in a detached manner but are made to feel that they are actively participating in all the processes connected with its solution. They find themselves surrounded by the atmosphere of social work rather than that of social research. As a result they do not learn merely about social problems; they learn how to deal with them. A typical university course in the administration of charities may make quite clear the problems in this field. A student in such a course may with great profit to himself make a study of different types of administration and secure results of value as social research. It is an entirely different matter to present this course in such a way that the student assumes the attitude of the participator rather than that of the observer and thus is made to feel as living realities the different methods and points of view of those at work in this field.

This type of technical instruction represents one of the great contributions of the schools of social work to the field of applied sociology. Without courses of this nature a high type of professional instruction cannot be given. A great mistake will be made by the universities that have recently become interested in education for social work if they believe that the addition of a field-work course to their traditional courses in social science will equip them for professional instruction. Nothing will more quickly discredit the recent efforts of universities to enter this field. It would represent a backward step in professional education in which the social scientist will have failed to take advantage of the painful experiences through which the technical schools of other professions have passed.

If the universities are to succeed in this field of instruction it is essential that they clearly recognize the difference between the course that lays emphasis upon knowledge through research and the

course that is interested in technique. At present the tendency in a few universities is to combine these two types of courses under the direction of an instructor who may know something about technique, but has himself never mastered it. Such a situation would not be tolerated in a medical school for there it is taken for granted that an instructor in therapeutics must himself at some time have acquired experience in that field through successful practice. Just here is the great difficulty the universities face in developing professional instruction in social work. Men of academic standing with experience in practical work are not easily available for teaching purposes. The bearing of this fact upon the problem under discussion should be recognized. Nothing can be more fatal to the influence of the university in this field of professional education than to assume that courses can be made vocational by a change in name and a slight modification of content. Vocational courses worthy of consideration in professional circles must be conducted by instructors whose minimum participation in practical work is sufficient to enable them to create the atmosphere of the social agency under discussion and to impart to the students its point of view.

The influence therefore of the university on the curriculum of schools of social work may not necessarily be in the line of progress. Their methods of instruction and attitude toward practical work will in many instances need considerable modification before they are equipped for effective leadership in this field. If, however, the necessary adjustments are successfully made, there is reason to believe that the universities' entrance into professional education for social work will exert an influence upon its standards similar to that brought about by their participation in other fields of professional education.

Where their influence is particularly needed is in giving greater emphasis to intellectual standards. The curriculum of schools of social work has been built up almost entirely by practical workers whose emphasis has chiefly been laid on the side of experience. The courses of study have been designed to teach how particular processes should be carried on and definite situations met. Along with this emphasis upon the value of training by doing there has



grown up, if not a distrust of intellectual studies, at least a failure to appreciate their proper place in a scheme of professional education. This tendency is by no means new for it has characterized the early stages of legal, engineering, and medical education. It is an inheritance from the apprenticeship system of training and must be outgrown as standards of education are raised.

It would be unfair to leave the impression that present courses of instruction in schools of social work pay no attention to academic standards. Much progress has been made during the past two decades since the organization of the first training classes. Courses of instruction usually incorporate the best results of social research and carry with them the customary quota of assigned readings. The chief difficulty is that the requirements in practical work are placed first throughout the whole course and are in some cases so heavy that time for study is reduced to a minimum. In one instance, the students in a school of social work spent their mornings in practical work with a social agency, their afternoons in classes at the school, and their evenings in participating in the varied activities of social settlements. The usual amount of readings supplementary to the courses were assigned to the students but it was manifestly impossible to insist upon the outside study necessary to make these courses comparable to a graduate school. While this may be an unusual instance it is fairly typical of the prevailing tendency. What is needed is not merely a recognition of the value of study but an arrangement of the curriculum that would make a proper amount of study possible. It is to be expected that the influence of the universities will be in the direction of increased time for study. Indeed, unless they modify to a certain extent their traditional point of view, they may go too far in their intellectual requirements and fail to build up a well-balanced curriculum.

Another serious problem of the curriculum has to do with the organization of the courses of instruction. What principles shall determine the arrangement of the subject-matter? Can these courses be made to give a better historical perspective and a wider knowledge of general principles without detracting from the interest that is always aroused by the immediately practical? Here is a problem

that is vital to the success of the professional school. If the independent schools of social work have erred in concentrating too great attention upon practical problems and immediate situations, the university courses in this field have usually gone to the opposite extreme. Will it be possible to build up courses that will avoid the shortcomings of both?

It would seem that the solution of this problem does not demand a radical change in the general type of professional course that has become most common. In so far as these courses are built up around a study of the problems with which social work has to deal they are essentially right in principle. Courses dealing with problems of the family, the community, child welfare, juvenile delinquency, immigration, housing, recreation, and similar problems, not only cover subjects with which social workers must be familiar but represent the best pedagogical method of approach.

Where they frequently need strengthening is in an increased emphasis upon the more general facts and principles that give a comprehensive understanding of the whole situation rather than a definite solution of the immediate problem. The problem itself should continue to be the point of departure and should lead in a natural way to a study of the historical facts bearing upon it. By beginning with the problem instead of the historical introduction so common in university courses, the interest necessary for concentrated effort is aroused and the interpretative value of the historical elements stand out more clearly. But the point where the usual professional course lays itself open to criticism is in its tendency to lead directly toward a consideration of methods and technique. The failure to give sufficient emphasis to the complex factors that enter into the problem under discussion and the causes that underlie it bring about a concentration upon mechanical processes and an overrefinement of technique, that may be useful to specialists who are to deal with particular situations but does not make them professionally educated in the broadest sense. The ideal in technical courses of instruction is to make everything contribute to a thorough knowledge of the whole problem which will as a matter of course include attention to the most approved technique.

If the technical courses of instruction deal in this way with specific problems there would seem to be less necessity for courses in which the entire emphasis is upon technique. The technique of family case-work would not need to be taught as a distinct process because it would be a natural part of the courses dealing with problems of the family, child welfare, juvenile delinquency, etc. In the same way the technique of community organization would be taught in connection with courses in community problems. Such subjects, also, as methods of publicity, financing of social agencies, office management and routine, and other aspects of social-work administration, might be considered more effectively in their immediate application to specific problems than in courses dealing exclusively with the technique of executive management and administration.

In this connection it ought to be stated that methods of social-work administration have never been given adequate attention by the professional schools. Courses in social work have usually been designed to prepare technicians rather than executives. Since the graduates of schools of social work have found their most available opportunities of employment with social agencies in large cities where they must serve for a considerable time in a subordinate capacity before being given executive responsibility, there has not been much demand for instruction in administrative methods. But with the recent development of social work in small towns and communities the graduates of a professional school will frequently be called upon to take a position where both executive ability and social-work technique are needed. Even if the executive positions in social agencies in the large cities can be successfully filled by persons who have come up through the ranks, this plan will not always be found practicable in the smaller communities. The new situation can only be met by an adjustment of the curriculum of the training schools which will provide the needed instruction along administrative lines. A recent effort to meet this need was the special course the past summer at Ohio State University for organizers and executives in social work. This course which was given by the university in co-operation with the Association for Community Organization and the American Red Cross was designed primarily for persons of social-work experience who gave promise of

capacity for executive leadership. During the eight weeks' summer session the attention of the students was concentrated upon the principles and methods of community organization and the problems connected with the administration of social agencies. This work was carried on through classroom lectures and discussions, assigned readings, and a limited amount of observation of the methods of local and state organizations. The remainder of the course, which covered a period of eight months, is being spent by the students as employees of organizations doing community work where under the supervision of skilled workers they are gaining experience in dealing with actual administrative problems. A course of this kind has real value for a picked group preparing for executive positions of considerable responsibility. Its chief present significance, however, is in calling attention to the value of specific instruction in administrative methods and in demonstrating one way in which this may be given with a fair degree of success. The course will have met more than an immediate need if it results in a greater emphasis by the professional schools upon instruction along administrative lines. Such a strengthening of the curricula of schools of social work will represent an important step forward in building up a well-balanced professional course of study.

This addition to the courses of study, together with the increasing number of courses that must be added to the curriculum to keep pace with the rapid development of the many different types of social work, has brought professional schools to the point where they must group their courses under separate departments and direct their students to specialize in certain lines of work. The time is past when students can take a general course of training in social work and then be equipped for a position with any agency they may select. The New York School of Social Work is attempting to meet the situation by devoting the first year to fundamental courses that may be regarded as common to all forms of social work, while vocational training in one department makes up the work of the second year. This selection of fundamental courses that should serve as a general introduction to the more highly specialized vocational work is a step in the right direction. Too early specialization has been one of the tendencies of the schools of social work which

has had the unfortunate result of turning out graduates incapable of seeing beyond their own particular field.

Just what should constitute the fundamental courses that should precede the highly specialized vocational studies is doubtless a matter about which general agreement cannot now be reached. It depends to a certain extent upon what is included in the preprofessional studies that have been completed before entering the professional school. Among the first-year courses listed by the New York School of Social Work are courses in immigration, labor problems, crime and punishment, methods of social research, American government and administration—topics which are ordinarily covered in a university curriculum. The difficulty is that with the present lack of uniform standards in college requirements in the social sciences it is practically impossible to know where to begin in a course of professional education for social work. Certainly no one would be so bold as to claim that the average college graduate has made such a study of the social sciences as would definitely prepare him for the technical studies in this field. The fact that he has taken certain courses may not be of any real significance. The content of the courses and the way they are presented must determine whether they are of preprofessional value.

The undergraduate course in social work given by a few universities would seem to be better adapted to meet this situation. In a training school of this kind it is not only possible to provide the proper number of preprofessional courses but also to see that they are properly correlated and conducted in such a way as to fit into the whole scheme of social-work education. Under this plan the preprofessional courses of the first three years would be followed in the Senior year by the more fundamental technical courses that would give a general knowledge of the field of social work. If then this is followed by one graduate year of specialized vocational training a standard of professional education would have been attained which under present conditions cannot generally be realized by the usual two-year graduate course.

*[To be continued]*